

We had incidental contacts with certain other free-world diplomats and a considerable number of Soviet and U.S. citizens. We visited widely in Moscow and Leningrad and observed church services in Baptist, Roman Catholic, and Russian Orthodox churches.

The coolness of our reception by Soviet officials and the limited compliance with requested contacts with top officials seemed intended to hamper achievement of our goals of exploring Soviet attitudes on the Cold War, on Viet Nam, on the Near East, on trade, and on religious freedom in Russia. However, the contacts permitted to us, and those we made ourselves, were sufficient to warrant certain general conclusions.

As I have mentioned, we can expect no thaw in the Cold War in the foreseeable future. Our policies will be concurred in and assisted only when the Soviet hierarchy is of the opinion that some tangible gain to their purposes will be accomplished. There was little if any evidence of different attitudes among others. The Soviet press, echoing the official line, constantly sows anti-U.S. propaganda. One newstand of Russian papers carried no less than four grotesque cartoons of President Johnson throwing bombs at helpless people. In no case did there appear to be any understanding of U.S. positions in the Far East, or indeed in the Middle East. Our policies seemed to be viewed as dominated by colonialism and economic royalists seeking to exploit. On the other hand Soviet citizens interviewed from Chairman of the Council of Nationalities, Paletskis, down felt that continued Soviet arms supply to other nations was justified and should continue.

At the same time there seems to be a primary involvement of government officials and private citizens with domestic progress, concentrating currently on the 50th Anniversary of the Revolution to be celebrated on November 7th. No one seemed to know just what the celebration will consist of, but all agreed it will be big. In view of this, particularly bitter resentment was expressed to U.S. press and television coverage given to Stalin's daughter Svetlana. This coverage plus reports of small university or other groups in the U.S. staging counter demonstrations on November 7 seemed to be attributed to the C.I.A. and as demonstrating U.S. official policy, dominated by big business. Even such an extreme event as the recent publicity about the American Nazi Party is seized upon in discussions by Soviet officials as demonstrating potential U.S. attitudes.

While much interest is expressed in U.S.-Soviet trade, current world conditions are held out as a bar to progress on it. As put by a representative of the Ministry of Foreign Trade, theoretically we do have the possibility, but it is not practical now. Reasons given are the Viet Nam war, requirements on using 50% U.S. shipping, licensing bans (referring to the Grand Coulee Dam generator ban), longshoremen's boycotts and a failure to grant the most favored nation clause. The Soviets consider they have a number of items we might purchase and they suggest long-term credits repayable in products produced in lieu of capital investments. U.S. participation in an international clothing fair currently underway was viewed favorably, as was a U.S. fashion show in connection with it. While the fashion show was excellent, the very poor and limited display sponsored by our U.S. Commerce Department compared most unfavorably with Poland, France, Italy, and Japan. If we were to participate at all, a better showing should have been required. The present one could only hurt our image by comparison. It is perhaps symptomatic of the very basic question for U.S. trade policy—whether increased trade and development of more consumer-oriented economy in Russia is in our interest and should be promoted. With present hard-core thinking and domination of public thinking there is little evidence that it can help on any basis other than a very long-range one.

Misunderstanding of U.S. thinking is so profound that the Soviets generally seem to believe that an increase in trade with the U.S. can come to dominate U.S. foreign policy through greedy business motives and that this will somehow be favorable to Soviet policies.

Meanwhile there seems to be little evidence of any easing of controls over the Communist society at home. While the proposed Flat plant will increase considerably the number of automobiles, we were told of little if any planning for parking or highways for the general public. While we were in Moscow another secret writers trial got underway. While religious services we visited were permitted, official disfavor limited them almost entirely to the elderly and to women. The only exception was the Baptist churches in Leningrad and in Moscow. There was no evidence shown us of any variation from total government ownership of property even down to the smallest kiosk or newsstand. The only exception to this came at a collective farm market where private sale of produce and handmade items was permitted. The attitude and salesmanship at the booths stood in marked contrast to all the other markets and stores.

We had considerable discussions with local officials on metropolitan problems such as housing, transportation, traffic and parking, and juvenile delinquency, or hooliganism as they call it. While the volume of new housing is impressive, the quality is not and foreigners joke about many of the buildings becoming "instant antiques", a label they appeared to merit. The prospect of a consumer economy as a wedge toward political enlightenment if it exists at all, seems a dim one. Yet it may be the only course to peaceable transformation.

Finally, a word about U.S. representation in Moscow. The U.S. Embassy staff headed by Ambassador Thompson, a profoundly experienced and wise officer, is doing a most difficult job under frequent harassment. While we were in Moscow another reprisal reaction occurred in the banning of two most capable U.S. officers from the Soviet Union. It was difficult to decide whether to commiserate with or congratulate them.

After thorough study of official notes of the meetings held and analysis of reactions of each of the members and staff, the Subcommittee will prepare and publish a report of its visit and findings. The foregoing, therefore, reflect solely my own views.

#### LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED BY EUROPEAN SUBCOMMITTEE OF HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, AUGUST 29 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 4, 1967

London: U.S. Ambassador David Bruce.  
Moscow: U.S. Ambassador Llewellyn Thompson.

U.S. Press Correspondents: Henry Bradsher, AP; Dick Longworth, UPI; Frank Starr, Chicago Tribune; Edmund Stevens, Newsday; Bud Korengold, Newsweek.

U.S.S.R. Foreign Ministry, U.S.A. Division: Korniyenko, Chief; Levchenko Assistant Chief; Sokolov, First Secretary; Sokolov, Second Secretary.

Mayor of Moscow, Pramishloff.  
Ministry of Foreign Trade: Manguloff, Chief of Dept. for Western Countries.

Pravda "Observer": Yuriy Zhukov, Viktor Mayevskiy.

Chairman Yu. I. Paletskis, Council of Nationalities of Supreme Soviet.

Za Rubeshov Magazine: Paramonov, Editor; Rabbi Levine of Moscow Synagogue.

Leningrad: Filonov, Deputy Chairman of Leningrad Soviet.

Helsinki: U.S. Ambassador Tyler Thompson.

Members of the European Subcommittee besides Robert Taft, Jr. were John C. Culver (Iowa) and John H. Buchanan, Jr. (Alabama). They were accompanied by Foreign Affairs Committee staff consultant Marion A. Czarnecki.

#### THE GROWING NATIONAL CRIME RATE AND THE INCREASED ACTIVITIES OF ORGANIZED CRIME

(Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota (at the request of Mr. SCHERLE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the growing national crime rate and the increased activities of organized crime in our Nation must be of serious concern to all Americans.

The State of North Dakota, I am proud to say, enjoys one of the lowest crime rates of any of our States. However, the people it is my privilege to represent are interested in this national problem, which is the topic of my most recent report to my constituents.

I have unanimous consent to insert this report in the Record at this time:

A professional agitator brought two busloads of New Yorkers to Washington recently and led them in a wild—at times violent—demonstration in the House of Representatives Gallery. At least two policemen were injured (one was hospitalized) and seven of the rioters were hustled off to a nearby police station. Almost within the hour, a local judge released them on \$10 bonds—the same penalty levied for double-parking in the District of Columbia.

It is strange indeed when law enforcement officials are given virtually no backup by the courts of this land. Time and time again we read of the confessed murderer or rapist brought to jail by hard working police officers, only to be turned loose when some clever attorney is able to convince the courts that his confession was given in an improper fashion.

The technicalities of the law all seem to be interpreted in favor of protecting the rights of the person who commits the crime, rather than the individual who is the victim of the crime. While violence and robbery are a nation-wide problem, it is one that can and should be solved at the local level by encouraging and backing up our law enforcement officials.

Individual criminal action, however, is in many cases the stepchild of organized crime, which is a national problem requiring a national solution but getting little, if any, attention from this Administration which has allowed the Eisenhower and Kennedy war on organized crime to grind to a virtual halt.

Figures developed by my Appropriations Subcommittee, which funds the Justice Department—including the FBI—point out graphically the fantastic indifference shown by the Justice Department under Attorney General Ramsey Clark in what they are doing to handle the increase in organized crime. With crime on an upsurge you would necessarily think that the Department of Justice's work level would increase correspondingly. Just the opposite has been the case.

Another strange statistic at this time of sharply increased crime is the fact that the average annual Federal Prison population has declined by nearly two thousand convicts during the past two years.

When Federal Prison System Director, Myrl E. Alexander, testified before our 9-man Subcommittee, I asked him: "Is it true that the crime rate in this country is increasing?"

Mr. ALEXANDER. I think so, yes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Why, with an increase in the crime rate would we have the lowest prison population in years?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I cannot be a total expert in answering this question. First of all, there is increasing use of Federal probation, which over the past 5 or 6 years has accounted for a substantial part in the reduction of our prison population.